In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, Chandigarh.

CWP No. 3793 of 2007

Date of Decision: 25.04.2007

Partap Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others.

....Respondents.

Coram:- Hon'ble Mr.Justice J.S. Khehar.
Hon'ble Mr. Justice L.N. Mittal

Present: Mr. R.N. Lohan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sanjiv Bansal, Addl. AG, Haryana
for the respondents.

...

J.S. Khehar, J. (Oral).

Learned counsel for the petitioner acknowledges, that the expunction of the adverse remarks, communicated to the petitioner, was based on the second representation made by the petitioner, after the first representation for the same purpose had been declined. Learned counsel for the petitioner, therefore acknowledges, that the controversy raised in the instant writ petition is akin to the one adjudicated upon by this Court in Vinod Kumar Vs. State of Haryana and others (Civil Writ Petition No.9805 of 2006, decided on 4.4.2007), wherein this Court has examined the validity of the action of the respondents in accepting a second representation made against the adverse remarks communicated to an

employee, after the first representation for the said purpose had been declined. And, it has been concluded, that a second representation is not permissible for the expunction of an adverse Annual Confidential Report.

In view of the decision rendered by this Court in Vinod Kumar's case (supra), we find no merit in this petition, and the same is, accordingly, dismissed.

(J.S. Khehar)
Judge.

(L.N. Mittal)
Judge.

25.04.2007
sk.